YALE DIVINITY NEWS

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Vol. I. No. 1.

YALE DIVINITY QUARTERLY.

Published by
The Students of the Divinity School of Yale University.

MAY, 1904.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

AN OLD PROBLEM FROM A NEW VIEWPOINT . 1
PROF. GEORGE B. STEVENS.

THE EXPIATORY ELEMENT OF THE ATONEMENT 7
REVEREND CHARLES ALLEN DINSMORE.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE PASTOR TOWARD CHRISTIAN SCIENCE 14
MR. JUDSON L. CROSS, '04.

HOLTZMANN'S LIFE OF JESUS: A REVIEW . 21
MR. HAROLD HUNTING, '04.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS 24
PROFESSOR FRANK C. PORTER.

THE DEAN'S LETTER — MARQUAND CHAPEL NOTES—SEMINARY NEWS—THE ALUMNI. . 30

Application made at New Haven Post Office for admission as Second-Class Mail Matter.

v. 1
04/05

80941

n.l
1904/05

The Theological Department

OF

YALE UNIVERSITY

(The Yale Divinity School)

Offers exceptional opportunities for regular and special instruction for theological students, or for those who desire to lay a broad foundation for the work of teaching.

The eighty-third year begins September twenty-ninth.

For information address the Dean of the Faculty,

PROF. FRANK K. SANDERS,

Drawer 4, Yale Station.

Yale Divinity Quarterly.

VOL. I. MAY, 1904. NO. 1.

AN OLD PROBLEM FROM A NEW VIEWPOINT.

PROFESSOR GEORGE B. STEVENS.

THE problem is that of the origin of sin, and the viewpoint is that of modern science in a twofold form, (1) that of literary criticism and (2) that of evolution. Formerly it was commonly believed that the Bible furnished an account and an explanation, alike of the origin of man and of the beginning of sin. The early chapters of Genesis were regarded as historical narratives to whose events dates could be assigned in terms of our era, and the apostle Paul was believed to have so employed their data that from his language could be derived by critical exegesis an explanation of the method of sin's origin and propagation.

Among the changes which criticism has introduced are these: (1) The view that the early narratives are religious legends similar in form to those of other Semitic peoples. They are penetrated by a higher spirit, by worthier conceptions of God and man and the world, but they are examples of ancient folk-lore and, in no proper sense, history. (2) The conceptions of a happy childhood of the race in the early time, the notion of paradise and primeval innocence, is a perfectly natural translation by primitive thought of a people's ideals back into the inaccessible past. All ancient peoples, in one way or another, have some kind of a golden age in the distant past. It is their dream or vision viewed *sub specie historiae*. (3) The Genesis stories, therefore, give us no historic information concerning the beginning of our race, or of sin, but they do reflect the primitive religious conception of the nature of man and of sin among the Hebrews, and,

in this view, are instructive for the history of religion. (4) The Old Testament, as a whole, makes practically no use of these stories considered as history. Paul probably regarded them in this light, but makes only two incidental allusions to Adam's fall and its consequences (1 Cor. xv. 22; Romans v. 12 *sq.*), and these are not explicit enough to enable us to determine what was his conception of the relation of the first sin to all later sins. (5) The Fall-story in Genesis does not, all things considered, carry the idea that physical death is the consequence of sin. That was one theory among the Jews and some so understood the Fall-narrative, as Paul undoubtedly did. But the Old Testament doctrine, taken as a whole, is that physical death is incidental to creaturely limitations. (6) Among the later Jews there were various theories of sin's origin. Perhaps the commonest was built upon the legend of the "sons of God" or "heavenly watchers" (Gen. vi. 1–6) from whose union with the daughters of men a race of wicked monsters was produced. There are traces of a kindred interpretation of Eve's temptation. Some believed that a native evil inclination was implanted in man from the beginning. With Genesis iii was chiefly associated the idea of physical evils entailed upon the race, and very naturally, since the story does not represent Adam and Eve as being essentially changed in their characters by their transgression, nor is there a hint in the whole narrative that their sin was the cause or explanation of the sins of their descendants.

The theory of evolution has given currency to such ideas as: (1) That of the great antiquity of man. The "Adam" whom Hebrew religious thought included in its genealogical reckonings, recedes into an indefinite, prehistoric past, and becomes but a symbol of an unknown beginning. (2) Those who believe in evolution hold that man was not created, as it were, at a stroke, but is the product of an immensely long development, physical and mental; that at some time and in some way which we can never know, the animal stage of existence was transcended and the process of evolution culminated in moral personality. (3) In this view primitive man, instead of being man at his best and highest, is man in his most imperfect stage. Instead of being, as traditional theology has pictured him, a creature in comparison with whom Aristotle was but the rubbish of humanity,

he was hardly more than a rudimentary person, with everything to gain—with the whole world of moral progress and achievement still before him. (4) While evolution feels no call, and professes no ability, to explain the origin of sin, its advocates properly enough suggest that since the general conception of evolution is now regarded by scientists as well established, and is no longer opposed even by theologians, it is incumbent upon religious thought to conduct whatever speculations it indulges in regarding the problem of sin on the lines of evolutionary thought.

It is needless to review here—or, perhaps, anywhere—the theological theories of the origin and spread of sin which have long obtained, and still obtain, in dogmatic tradition—the Neo-Platonic, Augustinian theory of sinning in Adam, and the seventeenth century, Federal idea of our being constituted guilty for Adam's sin by a divine fiat. It is not to be denied that these speculations carried with them some practically available truths—as did also the Ptolemaic astronomy—but to propound them as scientific explanations—as is still widely done—is like discussing physical science to-day on the presuppositions of the pre-Socratic natural philosophy. The reference of the origin of sin by Julius Müller and others to a free self-decision in a pre-temporal state is a proposal to explain the relatively unknown by the absolutely unknown. It is certainly not reassuring after reading what is, probably, the most profound philosophical disquisition upon sin that was ever written, to see the author take the problem of sin's origin and jump overboard with it. The history of speculation on this subject may well warn us that all our suggestions must be tentative. In plain truth, no human being knows anything, "in the strict sense of knowing" (as Mr. Spencer would say), about the origin of sin. It is a matter to which we have no access, any more than we have to the facts concerning the origin of the world or of man. Why, then, say or write one word about it? Because we like to guess, and surmise, and infer, and have a perfect right to do so. We know something about the nature and history of sin. Why should we not form some hypothesis concerning its origin which we may think congruous with observation and experience—just as, knowing something of man's history and of the world-process in general, we properly speculate upon the method of his origination? On this

understanding of the matter, I venture the following suggestions :

(1) Let us suppose that man — a moral animal — has now emerged. It matters not when or where he first appeared or by what steps and stages he was produced. His peculiarity is that he has what we call conscience — the sense of a difference between right and wrong, good and bad. When conscience first appeared man was created. His next of kin is the most highly developed animal, and yet, how great the difference ! So far as we have any means of judging, it was a long step from the highest animal to the lowest man. Be that as it may, we have now to do (in our speculations) with a moral being, raw, crude and inexperienced, with no character to speak of as yet, but with endowments and capacities which make him capable of acquiring character — capacities which open to him a whole world of growth and achievement from which the lower orders of creation are excluded by the limitations of their nature.

(2) Now if we think of primitive man in some such way as this, what supposition can we make regarding the beginning of sin which will agree with the evolutionary hypothesis ? One thing is clear : When man appears the possibility of sin is there. The animal does not, can not, sin. No sane man every really held an animal morally accountable. The most intelligent dog does not know what *good* and *bad* means ; he has not that pecularity or endowment which we call a moral nature. If he had, he would not be a dog, but a man. When you describe a being with conscience, you are describing a moral being. It is the glory of man — the badge of his humanity and superiority to his brute progenitors (if you will) that he can sin. The possibility of sinning and the possibility of virtue go together. No creature can become good who has not also the capacity to make himself bad.

(3) It is time to ask what sin is. In New Testament language it is " lawlessness," or an offense against law ; it is lovelessness, selfishness ; it is violation of right and truth, disregard of others' good, or the general good ; considered in its relation to man himself, it is the violation of his own higher nature and better knowledge. It would seem, then, that the first sin which we can conceive would be the first act or choice which was made in the light of conscience in violation of its behest. The moral nature

of man imposes upon him moral law—the sense of obligation to some higher authority. The violation of this law or obligation is what we call sin.

(4) But there is room here for some gradations and distinctions. We commonly use sin to mean : offense against God, and by that we Christians understand conscious violation of the holy and revealed will of the one Supreme Being. But in such a high sense of the word evolutionary anthropology would not admit that sin could be ascribed to primitive man. If he had any notions of a Supreme Being they must have been very dim and vague. Only in a crude way, if at all, could he have identified his moral instincts and ideals with the will of any Deity. To conceive of moral distinctions and obligations as absolute, that is, to appreciate their unconditional character, is possible only to developed man ; it implies no slight power of abstract thinking. Perhaps primeval man could do no better than to associate the notions of *right* and *ought* with the will of his associates. In any case which we can suppose, sin would have, in application to his acts and choices, a very limited meaning in comparison with that which it bears in Christian thought.

(5) In what form would sin be most likely to emerge? Is not this the most reasonable guess, that it would take the form of a conflict between the animal propensities and the higher nature, or more accurately, that it would consist in a failure to subordinate the animal nature to the rule of conscience? Habits and tendencies which in the animal are natural and useful would be sinful in man, that is, contrary to conscience, violations of the higher law of reason. In animals the instincts are a part of the law of self-preservation ; in man their unrestrained indulgence is sin. May not this be the real import of the Fall-story? The temptation came in the form of an inducement to indulge without restraint certain natural impulses. The late Jewish association of the origin of sin with Genesis vi : 1-6 is plainly in line with this idea. Paul's doctrine of the conflict between flesh and spirit, though not intended as a philosophy of the genesis of sin, is suggestive in this connection.

(6) But it may be asked : Is not evolution, then, simply bringing us by another path to the old theory that sin consists in sensuousness? I think not. The theory just mentioned rests

upon dualistic metaphysics—a philosophy which regards matter as essentially evil. Evolution has nothing in common with this theory, and, indeed, does not meddle with metaphysics. Some evolutionists may have expressed themselves carelessly and defined sin, without qualification, as animalism or brutishness, but by this must have been meant (or, at any rate, should have been meant) a yielding, consent, or cultivation of brutishness by a being conscious of a higher law. If sin were brutishness *per se*, then the brute would certainly be sinful. The idea of evolutionists is not that sin is the "ape and tiger element" in itself considered, for then surely the creatures which are all ape and tiger would be the worst of beings; the idea is that the first or most typical form of primitive sin is the domination of the ape and tiger element *in man*, that is, man's consent in the face of a higher law within him, to indulge the impulses which in the animal are natural and normal, but which in man, if uncontrolled, are abnormal and sinful.

(7) In the evolutionary scheme the first sin (if we allow ourselves for the sake of argument to imagine it) would not be the worst and most heinous of all possible sins, as traditional Christian theology represents it, but the most venial of all — the nearest approach to a mere "sin of weakness" which we can think of. The Fall-story has some kinship with this idea. There the consequences of the first sin are represented as mainly physical—subjection to the ills of human life. There is no suggestion that Adam and Eve were changed by their first sin from a character wholly good to a character utterly bad. Their sin is conceived as the first of an ascending series—the fratricide of Cain, the cruelty of Lamech and the general corruption calling for the deluge.

(8) What, now, about the propagation of sin? If sin, in its deeper meaning, is character, we must ask: Can character be propagated or inherited? One might as well ask: Can character be imputed? Man inherits, not sin, or guilt, or even, "tendencies to sin" (a mere abstraction), but a nature in which all the conditions of sin are given. Every man, as the Apocalypse of Baruch says, is the Adam of his own soul. "Adam" means *man* and the "fall of Adam" is an epitome of the experience of mankind. The notion that any newly born infant is sinful and

guilty is absurd. Its impulses are morally neutral; its self-centeredness, for example, is not original sin or any other kind, but a necessary condition of its little struggle for existence. Sin comes when with the dawning of moral life these impulses are indulged, and the sin is in the consent, the choice, the will. Man's task and triumph consist in subjugating all those instincts and impulses which we summarize under the term "the lower nature" and in making them subservient to the law of reason, righteousness and love.

THE EXPIATORY ELEMENT OF THE ATONEMENT.

REVEREND CHARLES ALLEN DINSMORE.

A COMPANY of young ministers were recently lunching together one Monday noon at a famous hotel in one of our large cities. The conversation happening to turn upon doctrinal themes, one of the men exclaimed: "Who believes in the expiatory theory of the atonement to-day!" "Why no one, of course" was the general response, felt if not expressed. A few of the younger ministers were mentioned as possibly being tainted with the ancient dogma; but it was finally concluded that only one or two derelicts, who had drifted down from a former generation, had the archaic notion stowed away as part of their mental cargo. This judgment was quite correct. Expiation is almost entirely excluded from many of our modern pulpits. The expiatory interpretations of the atonement are so inwrought with monstrous conceptions of God, and with artificial notions of divine government that with genuine zest many of us have swept them out of our theological workshops into the same rubbish heaps with infant damnation and a material hell.

There are two explanations of how Christ brings men into perfect union with God which have wide acceptance to-day.

One is that Jesus, being lifted up by his life and sacrificial death, makes such a revelation of the character of God that men are drawn into a sphere of gratitude and adoring love where the repentant soul spontaneously opens itself to all the sources of redeeming power. This insight, brilliantly and impressively stated by Bushnell, has been preached with signal effectiveness by nearly all the leaders of modern religious thought. Latterly a conception at once simple, of rare beauty, and singularly consonant with our doctrine of the incarnation has been gaining in popularity. "If," so runs the statement, "God and humanity met in such perfect union in Jesus, then those who by faith become Christlike are one with God." The atonement is thus an achievement. It is wrought in us by the spirit of God, rather than for us on Calvary.

Both of these interpretations have the merit of being free from legal and governmental technicalities, vital in statement, and true to our religious needs. That they are defective is readily seen when we view them in the light of three important facts.

The first is that they do not sufficiently take into account the devastating consequences of evil. They are severely individualistic. They center themselves on the problem of how God wins the heart and will of the one sinner. They leave almost entirely out of sight the supreme obstacle to forgiveness, viz. its destructive effect on others. This is all the more remarkable in a theological movement which boasts of its social consciousness, and which considers man especially in his human relationships. Sin is anything but a purely individual matter. The horror of it lies in the consequences it entails upon others. It goes out from the perpetrator, sending its ravage into society in ever widening circles, and casting its blight down through the generations. We have not adequately dealt with the difficulty of sin when we have shown how, like an ugly weed, it can be rooted out of the heart. Sin is a contagion. It treasures up wrath. It unleashes retributive forces which strike the innocent to their ruin. It is a trivial thing if it is confined in its effects to the one committing it, but the curse of it is that it passes into the social organism; it smites the innocent, it disfigures the generations unborn, it disrupts families, it demoralizes a nation. In view of the hurt of sin in the world the chief problem of the theologian

is not how God brings the individual to repentance and makes clear his abundant forgiveness, but the infinitely harder one of how he so restrains evil that forgiveness is possible.

Again these interpretions by failing to explain how the cross expunges the vestiges of sin from the moral order provide no atonement for the conscience and memory. They exhaust themselves in making plain the ways by which the heart and will are centered upon God, but they leave the contrite one with a blackened memory and a remorseful conscience. The cross must have an answer to Macbeth's despairing cry:

> "Canst thou not minister to a mind diseas'd,
> Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,
> Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
> And with some sweet oblivious antidote
> Cleansed the stuff'd bossom of that perilous stuff
> Which weighs upon the heart?"

The third indictment which can be brought against these explanations of the atonement is that by omitting the idea of expiation they break violently with the religious experience and thought of the past. The truth which the term "expiation" seeks to cover has been central in the sacrificial systems of the ethnic religions, and has been one of the elemental and most conspicuous doctrines of the Christian church for over a thousand years, in some form or other winning the cordial assent of the most penetrating and lofty minds of Christendom, both Catholic and Protestant, down to the present time. Fundamental in religion it has held a position of almost equal importance in literature. It engaged the absorbed attention of the supreme dramatists of antiquity; Aeschylus from his lofty pulpit taught no other truth of equal prominence: to him the law of expiation was as old as the throne of God and as inviolable; no other theme seemed to him worthy of his genius and the greatness of his opportunities. The plays of Sophocles owe their strange fascination and their magnificence of power to their insistence upon the same stupendous truth. It has been structural in the masterpieces of fiction in the last century. Henry James, writing of Hawthorne, says that life is an experience in which we expiate the sins of others in the intervals of expiating our own; while

Victor Hugo holds our wrapt attention from the first page of "Les Miserables" to the last as with preternatural power he unfolds the mystery of a soul of rare nobility wiping out the consequences of a petty sin. Expiation! it has been close to the heart of what is deepest in religion, theology, literature since man began to think and write his thoughts. It is found everywhere but in some of our modern pulpits! This is all the more remarkable since our best thought lays unusual emphasis on the solidarity of the race, and upon the witness of psychology. Yet expiation is a racial truth of commanding importance. The individual may apparently escape the recoil of his own transgressions, but the race pays to the uttermost farthing. Its age-long life receives the full reaction of the moral order. Expiation is also a deep-rooted need of the soul. Samuel Johnson stood all day in the rain in the market place in Litchfield that, on the spot where he had refused to keep his father's book-stall, he might expiate his sin. In obedience to this instinct Cranmer thrust his right hand, which had signed his retraction, into the fire, and Henry II. was scourged by monks at the tomb of Becket.

At the risk of appearing to be a brawler for exploded superstitions and past infatuations the writer begs leave to attempt to formulate the ancient dogma of expiation in terms of modern thought. To expiate, according to the Century Dictionary, is to counteract the evil effects of a crime, either by suffering a penalty, or by doing some counterbalancing good. Mediaeval theology seized upon the first half of the definition, and held that Christ by his sufferings rendered a just equivalent for the sins of the world. The more conservative exponents of the new theology, who wisely seek to rehabilitate, in the language of today, what was vital in the old, maintain that Christ's life and death were expiatory in the sense that they revealed God's condemnation of sin as well as his forgiving love. They upheld the majesty of the moral law, so that sin is not legitimatized, and God is seen to be just even while he is the justifier of the penitent. Many, especially in England, are won by the exalted conception so ably presented by McLeod Campbell that the confession of sin which Christ offered was expiatory in its nature.

Without in the least minimizing the value of Christ's suffering in counterbalancing the effects of evil by revealing and

establishing God's righteous judgments against iniquity, we urge that there must be an expiation toward man as well as towards God : that there are psychological needs as well as governmental and paternal ones. Sin entails consequences which are not counteracted by suffering, but are met only by a counterbalancing good. The bringing in of this healing and triumphant good is Christ's distinctive work. It is the ground of reconciliation. It is the heart of the atonement. This victory was not achieved in one convulsive moment on the cross. It found there its ideal fulfillment, but its completion is his eternal work. An illustration will make our meaning clear. In the " Idylls of the King " Tennyson gives a most noble description of Arthur's dream of a kingdom where the weak and innocent should be protected. But the Queen's guilty love for Lancelot shattered his fair ideal, and spread " red ruin and the breaking up of laws " throughout his domain. Guinevere fled to a convent, whither the good king, though deeply wounded in heart, sought her out. He revealed to her her sin :

> " For thou hast spoiled the purpose of my life,
> Bear with me for the last time while I show,
> Ev'n for thy sake, the sin which thou hast sinned."

He recounts the ruin of his hopes, but

> " Lo ! I forgive thee as Eternal God
> Forgives : do thou for thine own soul the rest."

At this revelation of the King's forgiveness the unhappy queen fell from off her seat and grovelled on the floor. Here we have a perfect type of the moral theory of the atonement. God's pitying love seeks the sinner and by disclosing itself wins him to repentance and a life of loving service. Further than this it does not go. Yet how incomplete is the reconciliation ! If the Queen were the deep-souled woman Tennyson portrays her to be, then her personal forgiveness would be far less important to her than checking the consequences of her crime. She would say with Othello : " Plunge me in steep down gulfs of liquid fire, but stay the fearful devastation which my faithlessness is making in the world ! Although I am one with the King in heart and will my conscience is a smoking mount of torment and my mem-

ory is a hell within me!" There can be no unshadowed reconciliation for the unhappy Queen, nor can the King restore her to the fullness of his heart, until they both by faith see Christ so controlling events that, even through her crime, a nobler England has been born than the England the good King had seen in his fairest dreams.

Does not this illustration furnish a clue to the solution of our problem? There may be perfect pardon for a wrong doer when contrition is adequate, but there is no complete reconciliation in the criminal's own soul, or between him and those he has wronged, so long as the results of his evil are working wrath and destruction. The *sine qua non* of flawless relationship is such a mastery of evil done that through it good shall abound.

To recur to our definition, to expiate, is to counteract the evil effects of a crime, either by suffering a penalty, or by doing some counter-balancing good. Theology has seized upon the first half of the definition. It held that Christ counteracted sin by suffering: some said the full penalty, others pains sufficient to vindicate God's moral government. The interpretation here advanced emphasizes the latter half. With the Fathers it maintains that the chief problem of the atonement is cosmical evil rather than individual sin, and that this must be met by the expiatory work of God in Christ. Yet the expiation comes not entirely through suffering a penalty, but also by doing some counterbalancing good. Christ's work is not a legal fiction which God accepts. It is a genuine reparation of the destructive consequences of sin. The agony is only a means to the redemption. The profound significance of his work is not in the anguish, but in the victory in which it issued. As Christ contemplated his decease he was transfigured. When he approached the cross he exclaimed: "Now is the Son of Man glorified: now is the prince of this world cast out!" By it he overcame the world: for the joy that was set before him he endured it. The cross is a temporal symbol of a supra-temporal act. There is an eternal atonement which is the work of the eternal Christ. "All things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist." He does not shrink from taking upon himself the full responsibility for the world he has made. He is identi-

fied with it. He is striving in humanity, bearing its iniquities, feeling its chastisements, being wounded by its transgressions, yet forever acting as the great physician, healing humanity's diseases, checking evil, overcoming sin, making the wrath of man to praise him, bruising the serpent's head, until finally the power of evil shall be bound, he shall destroy both sin and death, and God shall be all in all. This moral re-adjustment is the ground of our reconciliation with God and the Lethe of our memories.

If the objection is urged that this view necessitates universal salvation, it is sufficient to reply that we only assert Christ's victory and not the form it is to assume. The consummation will be such that both God and man will be satisfied.

That this interpretation of expiation is new may militate against it, yet it should be remembered that the truth it represents has always been implicit in Christian experience. The saints have ever felt that the eternal Christ was bearing their iniquities, taking the consequences upon himself, and so disposing of them in his might that his name should be glorified. They have believed that when they joined that great host whom John saw in his vision they would look into the face of God and, understanding his marvelous redemption, cast their crowns before him in passionate adoration, lost in wonder, love and praise. It is this rapturous vision of God in all things and all things in God that has been the hope and consolation of the redeemed in all ages.

The darkest aspect of sin is that its curse falls upon the innocent in accumulating horrors. It is not an individual matter so much as it is racial, cosmical. There is no gospel for the conscience and the memory of the sinner, and no redemption for the world, that does not energetically deal with the problem of the consequences of sin. If the havoc is irremediable and cannot be subdued to the Almighty's purpose and made contributory to his designs, then God could no more look with complacency upon the causes of this devastation than Arthur could live with Guinevere in unalloyed blessedness amid the smoking ruins of his kingdom. Sufferings which are satisfactory by effecting a righteous condemnation of wrong-doing are not sufficient. There must be a genuine reparation. As this is beyond the power of man, it is wrought by God in that eternal forth-putting of

himself which we call the Christ. This progressive redemption, culminating in victory, is expiatory in its nature, and is the ground of reconciliation. This high triumph over sin is the peace of the saints and an indispensable expiatory element in the atonement.

Milton has given beautiful expression to this thought. After Adam had sinned and realized that his deed would entail woe on all his descendants, he threw himself on the ground, cursing in utter agony. Michael comes to console him. The burden of his message is not God's forgiveness and the way to heaven, for what bliss is there for Adam while the damning results of his transgressions are visited upon others? Instead the angel takes him to a high hill, and shows him how, through sin, God will reveal his grace, until in Christ's triumph the works of Satan shall be destroyed. Our sire replete with joy and wonder poured forth his praise, and came down "greatly in peace of thought." For him there could be no redemption without a reconciliation with his past, and there could be no reconciliation unless in some way that past, with all its entailments, is seen to be gathered up into God's redemptive power. It is significant also that when Milton would show how Paradise was regained he did not choose the hour of greatest suffering, but the temptation, as prophetic of the victory of an age-long campaign.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE PASTOR TOWARDS CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

MR. JUDSON L. CROSS, '04.

IF ever there was a day when an apology was needed for a serious treatment of the subject of Christian Science, that day is past. No system of belief can take hold of the minds of a considerable number of people and have power over their hearts and lives, without having some basis of truth, even though such a system, with its basis of truth, may proceed by wrong methods to erroneous conclusions. The growth of that system of belief

known as Christian Science and its prominence and influence among a large number of people, who by no means represent the lowest strata of human intelligence and earnestness, justify us in applying to it the above principle. Whatever may be our ideas as to the personality of its founder, or the integrity of her metaphysics and theology, we must admit that the sect which has grown up about her, has certainly won a place of no small significance in the religious life of America.

A brief statement of its present day status will give us an idea as to its importance as a religious movement. At the present time the movement claims to have over 800 churches in various countries. In the United States and Canada alone it has 85 public reading rooms, 350 chartered churches with a membership of 70,000 persons and claiming no less than 300,000 avowed adherents. Their churches, especially those in the large cities, are crowded, though no sermons are preached, and it cannot be denied that this belief has reached many lives which have been untouched by other religious bodies, and has opened within them the springs of a happier, better life. The movement is gaining recognition from some of our leading specialists in the study of religion from a psychological standpoint, and, in the words of Prof. James of Harvard, "*it must now be reckoned with as a genuine religious power.*" * In view of the foregoing facts the question may well be asked as to what attitude the Christian pastor is to take with respect to this new movement.

Certainly he cannot ignore it. There is scarcely a community in our country which has not been reached by its influence, and sooner or later the average pastor will be compelled to take some positive stand respecting it.

Nor can the movement be disposed of by ridiculing it, or by holding up, in a purely polemical spirit, its mere absurdities and inconsistencies. That is perhaps the easiest method, but it is not the most successful as has been amply shown by past experience. A few words from Prof. Coe on this point are very pertinent. "It would be a great delusion to suppose that such movements (as Christian Science) make progress chiefly by con-

* "Varieties of Relig. Experience," page 94. See also "The Spiritual Life," by Prof. Coe, p. 190 ff., and Dr. H. H. Goddard, Clark Univ. in Art. in Amer. Journal of Psych. for 1899 (Vol. X).

vincing the rational intellect, or that they can be stopped by a counter appeal of the same sort. The human being to whom religions appeal, is not merely, or chiefly, intellect, but rather a highly complex organism of feelings and affections, impulses and aspirations, habits and instincts. . . . The purely intellectual factor is less influential than the other factors of real life. . . . We must study it from the psychological standpoint as we would other cults. They all touch human nature and the human soul at many points. . . . We must come to feel with those from whom we widely differ."

These words suggest to us what the right attitude should be. To meet most successfully and justly the problem presented by Christian Science, the attitude of the pastor must be as far as possible a sympathetic one based upon a study of the system in such a spirit as will enable him to recognize the good as well as the bad; what is true as well as what is false; what is of value to him as well as what is worthless. Such an attitude involves several duties which must be heeded in a fair and adequate treatment of the subject.

In the first place it requires a thorough knowledge of the system itself and of the scientific and religious principles on which it pretends to rest. Such a knowledge should be based on a careful investigation at first hand, not only of its literary sources, but also of its practical fruits and beliefs as shown in the lives and experiences of its most earnest adherents. Such an investigation is made possible by the spirit of willingness and freedom with which such adherents welcome inquiry and furnish information.

This attitude demands also a hearty recognition of the good which the movement has accomplished and of the truths which it emphasizes. Mr. E. H. Abbott says in his book on "Religious Life in America," in speaking of Christian Science and similar cults:—

"*All these sects are due generally to some protest against some prevailing error or to the need of greater recognition of some neglected truths.*"

There are four important truths asserted by Christian Science which demand most earnest attention on the part of the Christian pastor, and by the proper emphasis of which he can best offset the influence of the movement.

One truth which needs to be emphasized by the pulpit and which Christian Science insists upon to an extreme, is that of an *idealism* which shall offset the rank materialism of the age. So pre-eminently is Christian Science a protest against materialism that it becomes more of an immaterialism than a true idealism. But it has called attention to the need of insisting on the supreme value of the spiritual over the material, of the eternal interests over the temporary interests of men. Christian Science, in its denial of matter and the assertion of Spirit as the only reality, is, after all, but an extreme reassertion of the words:—"The things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal." Can we not see in it the crude, vague gropings after what our modern idealistic and theistic philosophy is asserting at the present time?

Another truth emphasized in this creed is a perfect trust in an all-powerful, ever-present God as the Power "in all, over all, and through all." In this respect Christian Science is a vigorous protest against two great errors of the present day, manifested in that arrogance of knowledge which boasts itself against God and in that modern spirit of paganism which assumes that man can live without God. In teaching this idea Mrs. Eddy does, to be sure, run theoretically into pantheism; but the original intention of the teaching and its practical result in the belief of her followers, is simply the idea of the ever-present power and love of an immanent, personal God, and this idea is one of the greatest sources of power in the system, in the motive which it gives for the living of a serene, undisturbed, trustful, courageous life free from fret and worry. Such a life is, perhaps, the noblest product of which Christian Science can boast. This is nothing but what Christianity gives and what every sincere Christian should have, but which many could well take over from the examples of Christian Scientists. One of the greatest bugbears of the present age is the strain of care and worry which seems to go with its strenuous spirit. Has the pulpit emphasized sufficiently the present, personal reality and power of God and recognized properly the contentment and courage derived from a genuine and hearty trust in the Heavenly Father? We need to re-proclaim Isaiah's strong, serene words: "In quietness and in confidence shall your strength be."

Another lesson which we can draw from Christian Science is the need and the power of an an optimistic view of life and of man. In this respect again, the Christian Science belief in the divinity of man's spirit and its oneness with God, and its insistence on the unreality of sin and evil, is but an extreme reaction against the pessimism which was characteristic of many of the doctrines prevailing throughout New England and in Calvinistic circles about the middle of the last century, and which asserted the depravity of man and the power of evil and sin over him. Against the ideas that this world is but "a wilderness of woe," and that man is "a vile worm of the dust," capable of no good in and of himself, Christian Science sought to lay stress on the other side of the truth and asserted man's intrinsic goodness. It declared that God was in the world and that the ultimate character of all reality is good, because God himself is good.

In doing this, it simply went to the other extreme of denying the reality of matter and the existence of sin and evil in the declaration that they are but delusions, because God is good and all is God, therefore all is good, and man himself, the reflection of God, can do no wrong. In its view of suffering and sickness, too, the Church, we must admit, opened the way for just such a reaction, by explaining them as the visiting angels of God, sent for our good or discipline, in such a way as to make the desire to escape them almost a blasphemy. Such a doctrine is not unheard of even to-day. Is it not easy to see how Christian Science, in its extreme optimistic views and its easy way of escape from these evils, would appeal to many people to whom sickness and evil were unaccountable and to whom there was no vivid sense of human depravity? "A religion of optimism is a religion of power; a religion of pessimism is a religion of weakness."

Probably the most characteristic thing about this peculiar faith is its insistence on what we may state briefly *as the duty to be well* based upon its belief in the power of the mind over disease and bodily ills which are but delusions or "errors of the mortal mind." The carrying out of this belief in the actual cure of disease is the standard by which it wishes to be judged and "the belief has been in a general way," says Prof. James, "corroborated by the practical experience of its disciples." As to the

authenticity of these cures, Dr. H. H. Goddard, of Clarke University, writes, after a wide study of the facts: "In spite of the severe criticism we have made of the reports of cures, there still remains a vast amount of material showing a powerful influence of mind in disease. . . . People of culture and education have been treated by this method with satisfactory results. Diseases of long standing have been treated and have been ameliorated and even cured."

This suggests another lesson which we would do well to emphasize, and that is the duty of exerting this power of the mind over disease which God has given us. There is no doubt but that a mere exertion of the mind and an adherence to a truer philosophy of life is all that is needed to dispel many of the petty ailments which many of us so often give way to and which, by their very nature, are inaccessible to the ordinary physician. The facts seem to show that much also can be done in this way for the alleviation and even the cure of actual disease.

Would not the frequent emphasis in the pulpit of the "Gospel of Healthy-mindedness" be beneficial and also effective in preventing desertion to the ranks of Christian Science? Is the attitude of the average Christian minister toward sickness and pain as helpful as it might be? Does he, in his pastoral capacity, earnestly search out the sickness and pain in his parish, and does he comfort and cheer the sufferer as he might? Does he realize the power over pain of the personal touch, of the cheerful, encouraging smile, of the soothing, comforting word? Does he realize, in his public prayer and worship, the need of many of his people to whom suffering and pain is the great, overwhelming fact of life? Or does he shut his eyes to the sight of pain, and confine himself to the more congenial work of the pulpit and the study, ignoring the commission of Christ to his disciples to heal the sick? May not his failure to meet human needs in this respect account somewhat for the growth and success of this so-called heresy?

There is need also, in a fair and thorough treatment of Christian Science, of a clear and definite understanding and exposure of its fundamental errors and evils which demand our attention. Its pantheistic tendency; its denial of common-sense principles and of the very elements which we believe go to build

up and strengthen true Christian faith and character and which contribute to man's progress; its inconsistencies in the practical, every-day application of its beliefs; its externalizing of religion and placing it upon a physical basis; its frequent cruelty in practice; its un-Christian character in its denial of the Atonement and the Resurrection, in its attitude toward, and use of, the Bible, and in its crude ideas of Christ; its inherent selfishness and conceit in its idea of an exclusive mission; its easy attitude toward sin and evil which might lead to license; all these demand the most careful attention and clear, definite disclosure on the part of the Christian minister.*

In such an attitude toward Christian Science, by heeding its lessons and by devoting time and attention to the needs of humanity which are suggested by it, much can be done by the Christian pastor toward the checking of its errors and dangers. Its success among intelligent and professedly Christian people casts a grave reflection on our secular and religious education. An ordinary grasp of the main principles and facts of philosophy, science and religion among the common people would make the continued growth and success of such a movement impossible. A more careful and thorough religious education along the lines of modern scientific and critical methods would make its influence among church members next to impossible and would prove a sure preventive of such crude uses and interpretations of scripture as this cult employs.

Above all, the pulpit must furnish a religion which shall meet the various and complex needs of those to whom it would minister. What men and women want to-day is a real, true Christian Science; a religion that is both Christian and in harmony with facts—the religion of Christ himself, who believed in the world of things and who believed in the mind and the spirit, saw them in their right relations, and found their common ground in God, the personal, ever-present, loving Father of all.

---

* For a recent and very thorough exposure of some of the most fundamental weaknesses of the system, see article on Christian Science in the "Atlantic Monthly" for April, 1904, by John W. Churchman.

HOLTZMANN'S LIFE OF JESUS: A REVIEW.

MR. HAROLD HUNTING, 1904.

THIS work,* by Oscar Holtzmann, impresses the reader as a careful and scholarly effort. But on the whole it is disappointing. It may very well be true, that he has made the most out of his subject that is possible from his general critical standpoint. But he has taken as his most fundamental premises certain pronounced positions with regard to the most unsettled problems in the life of Jesus. Hence one cannot but feel that he represents on the whole, a transitory stage in the history of this department of scholarship. His book does not seem to us to be notable for its important contributions of permanent value to the student of the life of Jesus Christ.

Holtzmann holds the current two-source theory as to the synoptic gospels, and shows a high regard for the historical credibility of Mark. He adopts Mark's representation that Jesus received his Messianic call at the Baptism, but kept it concealed even from his disciples until Peter's confession, and from the public at large until the triumphal entry. Holtzmann places scant reliance on the Fourth Gospel as a historical source, treating fragments which remain of the Gospel according to the Hebrews with much more consideration. As to this general position, its weakest point is its uncritical estimate of Mark. Since the publication of Wrede's *Messiasgeheimnis*, the majority of scholars recognize the need of a more searching criticism of Mark.

Coming now to the main features of the book, Holtzmann takes for his clue to the correct understanding of the life of Jesus, the assumption that the central motive of his ministry was his eschatological convictions. The coming of the Kingdom of Heaven therefore meant to Jesus the coming of the Last Judgment, which was to be followed by the Messianic kingdom. And inasmuch as the central theme of Jesus' teaching was the

* *Leben Jesu.* Von Dr. Oscar Holtzmann, Professor der Theologie in Giessen. Tübingen, Mohr, 1901. XVI, 428. M. 7. 60. *The Life of Jesus.* London. A. & C. Black, 1904. pp. 542. 15s.

Kingdom of Heaven, Holtzmann would sum up the message of Jesus as follows: "The end of the existing world is at hand, therefore repent ye." Now the eschatology of Jesus is precisely that element in his teaching which is most in dispute. Without denying that there was an eschatological element in Jesus' thought, we think it can be shown that Holtzmann, in making this the ruling element, has given us a distorted impression both of the teaching of Jesus and of his personality. There are other things in Jesus more prominent and more certain than his eschatological beliefs. And it is better to reason from the known to the unknown, than to misinterpret what we do know, by dogmas with regard to what is only imperfectly known.

The description Holtzmann gives us of Jesus, teaching, during his Galilean ministry is somewhat as follows: The Messiah is coming soon to judge the world, and to set up his kingdom. Only those are to be admitted into that kingdom who live lives of helpful love (See the judgment scene in Matthew: "inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these.") This principle of helpful love is the ruling one in Jesus' ethics; it constitutes a new piety. Even when it comes into conflict with the Mosaic law, the latter must give way. Holtzmann's discussion of Jesus' ethical teaching with regard to the law of love, is one of the best things in his book. But he nowhere indicates that Jesus derived this principle of ethics from his idea of God. As a matter of fact one would never suspect, from Holtzmann's description, that Jesus preached a new and remarkable truth about the fatherhood of God. The whole subject is neglected save for a foot-note or two. Passages plainly teaching this truth are either given a different emphasis, or are passed over altogether. For example, take Matt. 5, 43-48 — Luke 6, 35, where Jesus teaches the duty of loving one's enemies, "that ye may become sons of your Father in Heaven; for he sendeth rain upon the just and the unjust." Holtzmann remarks that Luke's version is probably the more original: "That ye may become sons of the Most High." For him the passage shows the greatness of the Christian life; "just as the Most High God is too great to allow his actions to be disturbed by the conduct of evil men; so a man should not allow any other person by his conduct to disturb the well settled order of his own life."

In discussing the parable of the tares, Holtzmann accepts Matthew's interpretation with all its allegorical and apocalyptical features. Instead of being an expression of an eternal truth about God's forbearing attitude towards sinners, it is a little apocalypse. One who is familiar with Jülicher's illuminating discussion can hardly be satisfied with this.

The picture Holtzmann gives us of the personality of Jesus is scarcely less unsatisfactory. The Messianic consciousness of Jesus, as might be expected, he makes wholly eschatological. Jesus believes himself to be the chosen one of God, destined to be the Judge at the Last Day. He accounts for the joyousness of Jesus' life, as contrasted with the gloom and austerity of John, on the ground that Jesus was freed from personal fear of the Judgment by his belief that he would himself be the Judge. He was therefore free to devote himself to the rescue of others. All this impresses one as unnatural and unreal.

Moreover the Messianic consciousness of Jesus belongs to a wholly different mental realm from that of his ethical and religious teachings. The former belongs to the realm of ecstasy and vision, the latter to that of calm judgment.* The former is the motive power impelling him to his ministry, the latter forms the content of his message. This makes an unnatural dualism in Jesus' life; a dualism one of whose two elements we could very well spare. For that which is of permanent value to the world, is his ethical teaching. His Messianic consciousness Holtzmann does not distinctly call a delusion, but he implies it. Such a dualism as this is not good psychology, except in abnormal cases and Holtzmann himself says that Jesus' ecstatic experiences were not of the abnormal sort, but were like the prophetic visions of Isaiah. The visions of Isaiah were simply the exalted experiences in which truths were revealed to him that afterward became his message. In like manner, we feel that Jesus' Messianic consciousness is to be understood in the light of the fact that he spoke "with authority" of God and man.

Holtzmann does not hesitate to point out human imperfections in the life of Jesus. In the woes which Jesus pronounced on the cities of Galilee, he finds the "pain and bitterness of an

* Holtzmann has developed this idea in a book supplementary to his Life of Jesus, *War Jesus Ekstatiker?* 1903. v. 143. M. 3.

agitated human heart." It is this same bitterness, caused by the Jews' rejection of him in Galilee, which prompted his harsh words to the Syrophenœcian woman. To Holtzmann the cursing of the fig tree is a strong expression of Jesus' vexation; prompted also, perhaps, by bitterness, because of the small following he had upon his entrance into Jerusalem. It is not surprising to find Holtzmann putting forward such suggestions in view of his general treatment of Jesus' character. It is not the Jesus whom we know, but a sort of inflexible Roman Cato, who meets us on his pages. It is true that the whole tendency of our times is to find Jesus' divinity in the divineness of his human life, lived under human limitations. But it seems to us, that Holtzmann has failed to rise to a true and worthy appreciation of the character of Jesus. And only in so far as a Life of Jesus does approximate toward a true picture of that transcendent life, can it be called successful.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

PROFESSOR FRANK C. PORTER.

Two great problems are just now chiefly occupying theologians in Germany. One is the problem of the dependence of the religion of Israel in its various stages and of Christianity in its beginnings upon foreign religions; the actuality and character of such influences, and their bearing upon the uniqueness and supernaturalness of the Biblical religion. Interest in this problem has been greatly stimulated by the famous lecture by Fried. Delitzsch on Babel and Bible, and a more substantial basis for it has been laid in the publication of the Code of Hammurabi. In regard to this relatively new and significant movement in German theology, the attempt to put the history of the religion of the Old and New Testaments into relation with the other religions of antiquity, we shall hope for some discussion in the future numbers of the QUARTERLY. The other problem concerns the personality and consciousness of Jesus Christ. In some form this problem must of course always be central. Just now the two special points most under discussion are the historical char-

acter of Mark's Gospel, and the relation of the eschatalogical or apocalyptical element in the consciousness of Jesus to the ethical or spiritual element. It is in Mark that the apocalyptical, Messianic element is especially prominent, so that the two questions are closely related. Wrede's book, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (1901, pp. 291, M. 8), disturbed criticism in its contented dependence on Mark as a primary and final document, and opened the question of the sources that lay behind it, and of their historical value. The most important product of the discussion thus started has been J. Weiss's *Das älteste Evangelium* (1903, pp. 414, M. 10). A smaller book which, however, has the unique quality and importance of all its author's work, is Wellhausen's *Das Evangelium Marci* (1903, pp. 146, M. 4. 50), a translation with notes. Each of these books, the second in a less elaborate and detailed, but not necessarily therefore a less important way, attempts to get back to sources behind Mark and to a history behind the sources, and one might add to the inner history behind outer events, to the mind of Jesus as the ultimate fact. The appearance of Baldensperger's *Selbstbewusstsein Jesu* in a third edition (I. *Die Messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judenthums*, 1903, pp. 240, M. 4), is also important, and the "Son of Man" controversy, started especially by Wellhausen, has not yet reached an end. An attempt will be made in our next number to sum up and estimate these and other recent discussions of the main questions at issue.

One of the significant signs of the times in Germany is the publication of popular books, often originally popular lectures, on theology by men of the liberal schools. Twelve years ago Wellhausen remarked, commenting on Robertson Smith's lectures on the Old Testament in the Jewish Church, that such lectures could not possibly be given in Germany. "Popularizing is not attempted here," he said, "because there is no demand for it, but in England and America the *waiters* are interested in critical questions." That a great change has taken place in Germany in this regard is evident from the following list of popular books by critical scholars, books of high quality and low price, to which I call attention especially in the hope that something here mentioned may be read by some whose German is not equal to large undertakings.

First among such popular books, both in circulation and in significance, must be put Harnack's *Das Wesen des Christentums*, of which a cheap edition is now issued in English (*What is Christianity?* Williams & Norgate, in the Crown Theological Library, 5s.).

Wernle's *Anfänge unserer Religion* (1901, M. 8), which is also accessible to English readers (*Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. I., Williams & Norgate, 1903, 10s. 6d.), belongs also distinctly to the class of popular works. This brilliant book must be reserved for fuller treatment after the translation is completed.

A book which will richly repay the labor of reading is *Weinel's Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (1903, pp. 316, M. 3). It consists of a series of popular lectures by one of the ablest of the younger New Testament scholars, a privat-dozent in Bonn, giving a history and estimation of the work of the century on the life of Christ, beginning with Strauss. With special fulness the views of those outside of the church who interpret the mind and ministry of Jesus either in a Socialistic or in a Buddhistic sense are discussed; and the writer's own treatment of the person and teaching of Jesus takes special account of these fundamentally diverging interpretations. The book is written with freshness and enthusiasm and with an unmistakable religious warmth and earnestness.

Bousset's *Das Wesen der Religion dargestellt an ihrer Geschichte* (1903, pp. 286, M. 4), is an admirable series of popular lectures on the chief religions of the world, and the distinctive nature and the future of Christianity.

Other books of the popularizing sort follow without comment:

E. v. Schrenck, *Jesus und seine Predigt. Vorträge für Gebildete* (1902. pp. 234, M. 2. 40).

R. Otto, *Leben und Wirken Jesu nach historisch-kritisch Auffassung. Vorträge.* (1902, pp. 76, M. 1. 35).

H. Weinel, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu. Zugleich eine Anleitung zu einem quellenmässigen Verständnis der Evangelien* (1904, pp. 130, M. 1).

F. Giesebrecht, *Die Grundzüge der israelitischen Religionsgeschichte* (1904, pp. 132, M. 1).

E. v. Dobschütz, *Probleme des Apostolischen Zeitalters* (1904, pp. 138, M. 3).

H. v. Schubert, *Grundzüge der Kirchengeschichte* (1904, pp. 304, M. 5).

This is, of course, only a partial list, but I doubt whether it could be remotely paralleled in interest and in ability by a similar list of English and American publications. These books are all by men of the modern type, and of scientific training. It is good that such men are attempting such work. It is certain that it will prove of positive value to scholarship itself. In popularizing efforts the religious interest is sure to receive fuller recognition and have a stronger influence than in the purely scholastic discussion of critical theories. In fact a warm religious tone and a genuine religious purpose pervade these writings. They give the impression of being written, not to spread a liberal theology, but to remove obstacles to faith and to bring the Gospel home to the mind and conscience of our age. To those who have feared that critical scholarship will be religiously barren, such books as these cannot but be a most encouraging indication of the essential harmony between a free search for truth and a deep concern for faith and life.

We may conclude these notes by a brief mention of some of the recent books in English, which rise above the usual level of mediocrity. In view of recent German discussions of the life of Christ, in which the Fourth Gospel is left quite out of the account, it is interesting that we have a new defense of the apostolic authorship of this gospel from the liberal (Unitarian) side, in James Drummond's *Inquiry into the Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* (1903, pp. 528, 10s. 6d.). The book aims to be "a complete introduction to the subject." This able and scholarly defense of the authenticity of the gospel is not a defense of its full historicity. "It is to be accepted more in the spirit than in the letter." "To those of us who prize it most it is an *interpretation* of a life already known from other sources." The writer consciously imported an ideal element into his work, and intended it to be a spiritual interpretation rather than a literal record of Christ's life. Nevertheless it is a work of genuine reminiscence and description of the impression which Jesus made upon this man. Its uniqueness results simply from his idiosyncrasy, and is as conceivable in 100 A. D. as in 150 A. D., and from an apostle as from an unknown writer. It is evident

that with all reservations Drummond would still let John have much weight with him in his effort to gain a true conception of the person of Jesus.

The external evidence for the gospels is also thoroughly reviewed, and so far as John is concerned with the same result, in Stanton's *The Gospels as Historical Documents* (Vol. I, 1903, pp. 288, 7s. 6d.).

In F. R. Tennant's *Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin* (1903, pp. 363, 9s.), we have a thoroughly modern and scholarly study of the history of these conceptions in the Old Testament, in Alexandrian and Rabbinical Judaism, in Paul and in the Church Fathers before Augustine. Just such work as this is needed on each of the great doctrinal ideas as a precondition for the reconstruction of theology.

Sabatier's *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit* (1904, $3.50), completed just before his death, is an eloquent plea for his attractive type of liberal theology, setting it in contrast alike to the Roman Catholic and to the Protestant dogmas of authority. Professor Stevens summarizes the book as follows: "Christianity is not a system whose contents can be embodied in laws and dogmas and imposed on the human mind and heart; but it is the nature of the Gospel to attest itself to reason and conscience by its moral appeal to human nature and needs. The history of Christianity is surveyed in the interest of this contention."

There are two important additions to our rather meager supply of first rate English commentaries: J. Armitage Robinson's *Ephesians* (1904, pp. 314, 12s.), in form and spirit, like Lightfoot's *Galatians* and *Philippians*, and Driver's *Genesis* (1904, pp. 420, 10s. 6d.), which will probably be the best for a minister's library for some time to come. The character of the series in which it appears, the Westminster Commentaries, edited by Lock, necessitates a certain popular, and one might say, apologetic character, and also a brevity in the notes which will be less regretted by the minister than by the student.

A notable translation is Jülicher's *Introduction to the New Testament*, by a daughter of Mrs. Humphrey Ward (1904, pp. 635, 16s.). The first edition of this classical work appeared ten years ago, and the "3d and 4th," from which this translation is

made, in 1901. It should have been translated earlier, and should be issued at a lower price. Yet it is very much to be hoped that our ministers will regard this as one of the necessary tools of their trade.

Three books from nearer home should have special notice. Prof. Brastow's *Representative Preachers* (1904, pp. 423, $1.50), is dedicated to the graduates of Yale Divinity School. It contains essays on Schleiermacher, Robertson, Beecher, Bushnell, Brooks, Newman, Mozley, Guthrie and Spurgeon. There is surely no better teaching of the preacher's art than by great examples keenly analyzed and sympathetically interpreted.

Dr. Munger's *Essays for the Day* (1904, pp. 227, $1.00), contains the essay on The Church : Some Immediate Questions, which attracted much attention when it appeared a year ago in the "Atlantic"; also Christianity and Literature, Notes on the Scarlet Letter, The Secret of Horace Bushnell, A Layman's Reflections on Music, and A Cock to Aesculapius. Here one comes anew into refreshing contact with the mind of a preacher whose inspiration is in literature and in the wide world of human life into which literature opens the way.

Prof. Kent's *Beginnings of Hebrew History* is the first of six volumes of *The Student's Old Testament* (1904, pp. 382, $2.75, or to subscribers for the set, $2.10). In this edition the Old Testament material is rearranged in a "logical order," that is, according to subject matter ; the current critical analysis is indicated, and different accounts of the same events are printed in parallel columns. The translation is a revision, not very radical, of the revised version. Marginal notes analyze and summarize the contents of the text, and brief foot-notes explain obscurities. The book is skillfully adapted to convey, with brevity and clearness, the general results of recent literary and historical study, and to help even the layman to an intelligent and interested reading of the Old Testament.

Yale Divinity Quarterly.

GEORGE D. CASTOR, '04, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF.
GEORGE H. DRIVER, '05, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.
OSCAR E. MAURER, '06, ASSISTANT EDITOR.
ALBERT E. RORABACK, '05, ALUMNI EDITOR.

PROF. FRANK C. PORTER, PH.D., FACULTY ADVISOR.

MARION L. BURTON, '06, BUSINESS MANAGER, 63 Clark St., New Haven, Conn.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, 50 CENTS A YEAR

if paid prior to Jan. first. Otherwise, 75 cents a year. Single copies, 20 cents.

The date upon a subscriber's address, indicates the expiration of his subscription. It will be assumed that a continuation is desired unless notice to the contrary is received Address ALL communications to the YALE DIVINITY QUARTERLY, Box 917, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.

YALE DIVINITY QUARTERLY salutes you! May you find pleasure and profit in her budget of Yale thought and Yale news. The prompt response of Alumni and students to the circulars sent out this Spring has insured the first year's publication, and we hope by another year to have won such a welcome among Yale Divinity men everywhere as to leave no question regarding the future. The many letters which have come to us show conclusively that there is a real need for the QUARTERLY to fill. Scores of them contain such expressions as: "Good luck!" "Splendid idea!" "Good success to you!" "The very thing we need!" Evidently Yale alumni do wish to be kept in touch with each other and their seminary, and both Faculty and students are giving us their hearty support. Dr. Munger expressed the general feeling when he wrote, "The Yale Divinity School has long enough been silent."

The general plan for the QUARTERLY, as outlined in our circulars, is already known to you. You will be interested to know, however, that Dr. Munger and Prof. F. C. Porter are expected to write articles for our next issue. Different professors will be asked in turn to take charge of the book reviews, so that all departments of theology may receive special attention. It may be well also to repeat what we have already said, that helpful articles, alumni news, and suggestions of every sort will be welcomed by the board. We trust that all who are in any way connected with the Yale Divinity School will consider that this is their magazine, and will take a personal interest in it.

G. D. C.

THE DEAN'S LETTER.

For the sake of coming more frequently into touch with the Alumni, I have asked the privilege of a few columns in the QUARTERLY which may take the place of the annual informal report which I have hoped to prepare and send to each alumnus.

The new catalogue for 1904-5 has recently come from the printer. It will be sent to anyone who cares to send a postal request. It is larger than ever by some eleven pages, and exhibits, in telling fashion, the strength of the theological instruction given at Yale at the present time. There is a world-wide difference between the curriculum of the schools of divinity of twenty-five years ago or even of a large number of those of to-day and the working schedule of our seminary. The list of courses offered and the time-table make this evident. The university advantages are freely used by our students and, in the main, with great good sense. The lengthening of the Seminary year so that it regularly closes three weeks before the University Commencement makes participation on the part of the theological students in university courses on even terms entirely practicable.

The past year has been one of interest and profit. The lectures given before the School have been notable for attractiveness and strength. Dr. Lyman Abbott reverted to old traditions both in his theme for the Lyman Beecher lectureship, "The Christian Ministry," and in his open parliament which followed each lecture. President Mackenzie of Hartford, on "Problems of the Consciousness of Jesus Christ," ably sustained the high level of the new Taylor lectureship, inaugurated a year ago by Professor Knox. Professor James Orr of Scotland, Rev. Charles Allen Dinsmore of Boston, Mr. John R. Mott of New York, and Rev. Dr. Samuel W. Dike of Auburndale, Mass., each in a field which was peculiarly his own, set forth points of view regarding philosophy, literature, missions and sociology of the greatest practical value.

Learning is not preferred to godliness. The religious life of the Divinity School is steady and strong. The men take a vigorous and important part in the religious activities of the city and with apparent relish. The daily chapel service is made attractive by the very effective co-operation of the organist and choir, with the chaplain in the rendition of a short but beautiful ritual. On Fridays the experiment of substituting an address by a member of the Faculty or by some outside friend, has passed into an established custom. It affords a valued opportunity for informal counsel from ministers and teachers of wide experience. On February 8th an all-day conference on Foreign Missions was greatly enjoyed.

The Faculty is doing business as usual. Nearly every member has some literary undertaking under way. Professor Brastow published in February "Representative Modern Preachers," a volume with which most of the Alumni have doubtless already made themselves acquainted.

Professor Kent's first volume in the "Student's Old Testament," published in April, deserves mention in this connection, both because of his very close and valued association with our Faculty and students and because the editor-in-chief of the QUARTERLY, with other divinity students in his seminary, rendered constant assistance. Of the articles which members of the Faculty have written, of the public lectures or addresses delivered, and of the innumerable other contributions made to the welfare of the world there is no room for mention. Yale is receiving to-day her full share of honors and aiming to do her portion of the service for which the religious and social world has the right to call.

The Faculty ladies are unremitting in their zeal for the social well-being of the school. From the annual outing at the shore, which bids fair to become a fixed event on the first Wednesday of the Fall term until the Alumni reception at the Anniversary, there is a series of social evenings of great variety. It will not be easy to suggest a marked improvement of the present scheme until some generous friend presents the Divinity School with a "Deanery" adjacent to East Divinity Hall.

I venture to hope that the publication of this QUARTERLY will help to bring the graduates into still closer connection with the Divinity School. The bond is still quite precarious in the case of many. Our news from the Alumni or concerning them is accidental. Our working connection with them is slight. Yet the future of the Divinity School rests to an appreciable degree upon the Alumni.

They can promote it in three practicable ways: First, by informing the Faculty regarding men of promise at college who can be invited to study at Yale; secondly, by giving friendly information and advice regarding men who may be induced to make a gift to the funds of the school; thirdly, by the organization of local alumni associations which will get together once a year or oftener for fellowship. Co-operation in these and other ways the Faculty will welcome and deeply appreciate.

F. K. S.

MARQUAND CHAPEL NOTES.

The many generations of Yale Divinity men who have grown familiar with Marquand Chapel will certainly be interested in a few of the many valuable suggestions given to us there. Rev. H. H. Tweedy, of Bridgeport, Conn., outlined a plan for dealing with the weekly prayer meeting, a plan which has *worked*. Half of the hour is devoted to the Sunday school lesson. The second half hour is then in the hands of an organization best explained by the following, which is printed on its membership card: "The South Church Religious Study Club. In Connection with the Midweek Service. Objects: 1. To uplift by worship. 2. To learn by open-minded study. 3. To grow in depth and beauty of character by means of gracious and helpful fellowship. 4. To

apply Christian principles to modern problems and Christian standards to modern life. I desire to become a member; and in order that I may be most helpful to the Club and that the Club may be most helpful to me, I agree *to try:* 1. To attend as regularly as health, home and work permit. 2. To study each week as I have opportunity. 3. To add so far as I may to its enjoyment and helpfulness. 4. To do what I can to stimulate others to come. Name..... Address....."

The topics discussed by the club are varied, including the application of Christian principles to modern life, individual and social; church interests, such as church music or history, and allied topics. The regular preparatory lecture and the occasional praise service add variety to this plan of mid-week worship.

Another talk which sounded an equally practical note, though in a different sphere, was given by Dr. Lyman Abbott. He emphasized the need of the quiet hour in the pastor's life. His own practice is most suggestive. On each day, even on the busiest, he sets aside the hour after dinner as his own. He retires at that time to his study, bidding his family not to disturb him "unless the house is on fire and the fire has reached the second story." Then he is free to catch up a book, dip into poetry, meditate with folded hands, or rest, just as his mood may guide. By his own testimony these hours are spiritually among the most fruitful in his life.

G. H. D.

SEMINARY NEWS.

Condition of Professor Day.—We regret to say that Reverend Professor Day, '38, who has always been noted for his activity and interest in all the affairs of the Divinity School, slipped and fell, in his home on April 5, breaking his hip. He has been confined to his bed since, and his condition is regarded as serious, though his recovery is not impossible. His mind is as cheery and active as ever, his thought seeming to dwell upon the outlook for the Church and the great opportunity in the Ministry of to-day.

Debating.—The Divinity School was represented on two victorious intercollegiate debating teams this year, M. L. Burton, '06, having won a place in the Yale-Harvard contest, and Jason N. Pierce in the debate with Princeton. Besides this, a Seminary team, composed of E. T. Whitford, Lic., H. F. Bell, '05, and O. J. Billings, '05, met the Law School in the University Debate Preliminaries, and won the decision.

Athletics.—The excellent work done by W. J. Hail, '05, Captain of the University Cross-Country Club, has given the Seminary an important place in the University track events. Mr. Hail has run in all the Intercollegiate and University meets of the season, and has taken two firsts, a second and a third, in the two-mile run.

L. C. Porter, '06, a hurdler with college records, took a first and a second in the fall handicap games.

In the tennis tournament with Hartford, last fall, Messrs. Guernsey, Seabury, Hines, Porter and Scott, won both events. Yale finally scored a victory against Hartford in baseball, May 7, score 7 to 9, but lost the second game in Hartford, May 16th, score 11 to 9. O. E. M.

THE ALUMNI.

The oldest living graduate is Rev. Julian M. Sturtevant, '30. He is in active service in Ravenswood Church, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. John D. Sands, '47, is not too old to be interested in Yale, but was among the first to send his subscription for the QUARTERLY.

Prof. E. Sneath, '84, of Yale University, has recently published "Philosophy in Poetry."

The daughter of Rev. Wayland Spaulding, '84, Ayer, Mass., has recently been elected to the Professorship of Greek Archæology at Vassar. Mr. Spaulding has returned from his six months' stay in Europe.

"About one-third of the class are now in business" are the significant words of the '85 Class secretary.

Rev. William H. Medlar, '85, York, Neb., attended the Sunday school convention in Jerusalem.

Rev. Chas. P. Macfarland, '97, Malden, Mass., was recently married to Miss May P. Merrill at Andover, Mass.

The following changes have taken place during the past year:

'69—Isaac Pierson resigns, Medford, Mass.

'72—Elisha W. Miller accepts principalship of Washburn Seminary, Beaufort, N. C.

'73—George L. Griffin resigns, Bangor, Me., to study abroad.

'75—Arthur J. Benedict accepts, Tombstone, Ariz.—Gilbert A. Curtis resigns. Newbury, Vt.—Charles L. Morgan accepts, Elgin, Ill.—James Oakley accepts, Grand Meadow, Minn.

'76—R. G. Bugbee accepts, Orfordville, N. H. — John W. Horner, installed Revere, Mass.

'77—Jonathan E. Bissell accepts, Streator, Ill.—Foster R. Waite accepts Superintendency of Hartford Orphan Asylum.

'78—Malcolm J. Cameron, Hamilton, Ontario, called to Hillsboro, Wis.—George H. Cate, West Newton, Mass., called to Marshfield Hills, Mass.—Dennis Goodsell resigns, Picard, Cal.—Willard G. Sperry resigns presidency of Olivet College, because of ill health.

'79—Frank A. Bissell accepts, Green Valley, Cal.

'81—Pliny B. Fisk resigns, Lake Henry, S. D.

'82—George Lindsay resigns, Chamberlain, S. D.—William G. Mann appointed General Missionary to Eastern Maine—William A. Thomas resigns, Trumbull, Ct.—Francis H. Viets resigns, Buckingham Ct.

'83—Nicholas Edwards accepts, Whittier, Cal.

'84—Alfred E. Colton is N. E. Representative of Am. Bible Soc.—Henry W. Hunt accepts, Romeo, Mich.—David C. Reid resigns, Leicester, Mass.—Isaiah W. Sneath accepts, Grand Avenue Congregational Church, New Haven, Conn.

'85—Jeremiah Cromer accepts, Wellington, Ohio—E. Lyman Hood accepts, Jacksonville, Fla.—Charles L. Kloss accepts, Central Church, Philadelphia, Pa,—Harry C. McKnight, East Longmeadow, Mass., called to Coventry, Mass.—D. W. Morgan resigns, Barrington, N. H., because of ill health—Charles H. Small becomes Secretary of State Home Missionary Society, Springfield, Ohio—John A. Starner called to Burlington, Wis.—Thomas M. Yundt resigns Superintendency of Orphan Home, Womelsdorf, Penn,

'86—Wilson C. Wheeler accepts, Wellington, Kan.

'88—Lewin F. Buell accepts, South Norwalk, Conn.—Frederick D. Greene becomes Secretary of American Institute of Social Science, New York City—D. M. James resigns, Plymouth, Mass.

'89—Arthur Phelps has become pastor of Baptist Church, Ontario, Cal.

'90—Daniel E. Burtner accepts, Williamsport, Pa —Josiah P. Dickerman accepts, Pontiac, Mich.

'91—Timothy C. Craig accepts Chaplaincy of State's Prison, Wethersfield, Conn.—Edward A. George accepts, First Church, Ithaca, N. Y.—Dorr Hudson accepts, N. Chelmsford, Mass.—David L. Kebbe accepts, Greenwich, Mass.—Eldridge C. Whiting accepts, Memorial Church, South Sedbury, Mass.

'92—Frank L. Garfield accepts, Castleton, Vt.—Frank L. Johnston accepts, Tabernacle Church, Kansas City, Mo.—Richard Owen (Episcopal), called to Spring Valley, N. Y.

'93—Edward P. Ayer accepts, North Guilford, Conn.—John L. Evans accepts, Auburn, Mass.—Edward E. Keedy installed at Warren Church, Westbrook, Me.—H. M Lawson accepts, Hanover, Conn.—Robert Paton accepts principalship of New Rockford Academy, Carrington, S. D.—Charles R. Shatto accepts, Hampton, Ia.—Nelson R. Stewart resigns, Rocky Hill, Conn.—C. E. Ewing, Unionville, Conn., returns to China this summer.

'94—Henry C. Meserve, Indianapolis, Ind., accepts, Danbury, Conn.—John W. Norris accepts, Memorial Church, Worcester, Mass.—James A. Solandt resigns, Lead, South Dakota.

'95—Francis C. Bliss resigns, Amery, Wis.—Frank O. Krans resigns, Medford, Minn.—Harry W. Johnson, New Richland, Minn., called to West Duluth, Minn.—Parley P. Womer called to Danforth Church, Syracuse, N. Y.

'96—John Deans accepts, North Church, Providence, R. I.—Henry O. Hannum accepts, Pilgrim Church, Superior, Wis.—Edwin L. Noble accepts, Biddeford, Me.—William Weeks accepts, Andover, Conn.

'97—Daniel O. Bean accepts, New Ulm, Minn.—Archibald M. Hall resigns, Springfield, Ill.—Frederick Lynch accepts, Pilgrim Church, New

York City. At installation principal addresses were by Dr. Bradford, Dean Sanders and Dr. Jefferson—J. H. McLaren accepts, West Pullman Church, Chicago, Ill.—Wesley E. Page goes to Ellsworth, Conn.—Frank H. Rall has gone to First M. E. Church, Baltimore, Md.—Grant L. Schaffer accepts, West End Church, Bridgeport, Conn.

'98—Arthur E. Fraser accepts, Ivanhoe Park Church, Kansas City, Mo. —Cyrus F. Stimson accepts, Westminster Church, Kansas City, Mo.

'99—Christopher R. Hamlin resigns, Lincoln, Neb.—Eugene W. Lyman accepts professorship of Systematic Theology, Congregational College, Montreal, Canada—David Y. Moore accepts, Odell, Ill.—Burt L. York accepts, West Medford, Mass.

1900—George F. Abel ordained at Elmwood Temple, Providence, R. I. —George R. Montgomery accepts professorship at Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.—Richard Peters accepts, Baldwinsville, Mass.—Jay B. Stanton accepts, Villa Park Church, Denver, Col.

'01—F. Q. Blanchard accepts, First Church, East Orange, N. J.—W. H. Hayes accepts, Windsor, Vt.—George R. Lockwood accepts, Glenolden, Pa.—Charles W. Merriam accepts, Greenfield, Mass. At his installation, Blanchard, '01; Stocking, '01; Woodrow, '92, and C. L. Morgan, '75, took part—F. M. Sheldon, Greeley, Col., called to First Church, Pueblo, Col,—Alfred E. Thistleton becomes assistant pastor at Schenectady, N. Y.

'02—E. F. Barrow ordained and installed at Zion Church, Haverhill, Mass.—Shelton Bissell, installed at West Winfield, N. Y.—Frank J. Bruno accepts, Granby, Conn.—T. P. Gales accepts, Alton, Ia.—Ludwig Thomsen accepts, Cambridge, Ill.

A. E. R.

OVER

5,000 SECOND-HAND THEOLOGICAL BOOKS

Constantly on hand.

Catalogue just issued Free upon Application.

SEND US YOUR WANT LIST.

New Theological Books of all Publishers as Soon as Issued.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

132 East 23d St., Cor. Lexington Ave., New York.

THEO. E. SCHULTE, Mngr.

INDIVIDUAL COMMUNION SERVICE

Choice designs in several materials, including silver. Send for Catalogue (D 2) and full particulars.

"Our people are delighted with your Individual Communion Set here in Detroit as they were in my former parish, the First Baptist Church, Worcester, Mass."—*Spencer B. Meeser, D. D.*

"Admirable in design, splendid workmanship, serviceable material."—*R. N. Simms, Raleigh, N. C.*

"Your service is the simplest, neatest, easily and surely handled."—*F. P. Shumway, Boston.*

"More and more convinced that this selection was of the best."—*Alexander Lewis, Worcester.*

GEO. H. SPRINGER, Manager, 256 and 258 WASHINGTON ST., Boston, Mass.